

REMARKS

In the July 6, 2005 Advisory Action, the Examiner asserted that the May 25, 2005 Reply was "not responsive." Despite this statement, the Advisory Action responded to the arguments in the May 25, 2005 Reply. The comments in the Advisory Action are addressed below.

The Advisory Action maintained the rejections of all of the claims as either anticipated by or unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,581,691 to Hsu et al. Since the May 25, 2005 Reply discussed and responded to these rejections (despite the assertion in the July 6, 2005 Advisory Action that the Reply was not responsive), the remarks in the May 25, 2005 Reply will not be repeated. The arguments set forth therein still apply and are further supported by the amendments made to the independent claims, as discussed below. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in light of the arguments in the May 25, 2005 Reply, the Examiner Interview held May 19, 2005 and the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "the process executing data [is] received from the process executing data interchanging unit" (claim 1, lines 9-10) by "an interprocess association information interchanging unit" (claim 1, line 6). In claims 12 and 15, the process executing data interchanging unit has been added to the preamble, while receipt of the process executing data from the process executing data interchanging unit has been added to claim 12 and a similar limitation has been added to claim 15. Claims 16 and 21 have been amended in the same manner as claim 1, except that in claim 16 the source of the process executing data is the "executing data interchanging unit" (claim 16, last two lines) and in claim 21 the source of the process executing data is the "executing data interchanging means" (claim 21, last two lines). This routing of data is illustrated in the flowchart block labeled S2 in Fig. 11.

Claims 17, 19, 22 and 23, the bodies of which recite method operations, have been amended to recite providing first and second communication routes for process executing data. Nothing has been cited or found in Hsu et al. of separate communication routes as recited in the claims 16, 17, 19, 22 and 23, particularly by separate units or means as recited in claims 1, 12, 15 and 21. As indicated in Fig. 11, the second communication route provides the ability to send process executing data, such as a "slip" in the example illustrated in Fig. 11, from the usual transmission route via a process executing data interchanging unit or executing data interchanging means as recited in claims 1, 12, 15 and 21.

For the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1, 12, 15-17, 19 and 21-23, as well as claims 2-11, 13, 14, 18 and 20 which depend therefrom patentably distinguish over Hsu et al.

Summary

It is submitted that Hsu et al. does not reach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-23 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

9/24/15

By: _____



J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501